

**WAUKESHA COUNTY
MINUTES OF THE PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
ADMINISTRATION CENTER
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 2008, 1:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Pat Haukohl, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Commission

Members Present:	Robert Peregrine	Gary Goodchild	Jim Siepmann
	Walter Kolb	Bonnie Morris	William Mitchell
	Patricia Haukohl		

Commission

Members Absent:

Staff

Members Present:	Richard L. Mace, Planning and Zoning Manager
	Amy Barrows, Senior Land Use Specialist
	Elfriede Sprague, Clerk III
	Kathy Brady, Secretary Supervisor

Guests Present:	Kevin Frisinger	John Konopacki
	Dean Danner	Sandhya Singh, ADRC
	Dick and Kathy Garbe	
	Dick Sherer, Deep River Partners, Ltd.	
	Brian Witteman, Deep River Partners, Ltd., Project Architect	

Mr. Mace introduced Mr. Robert Peregrine from the Town of Oconomowoc as Mr. Baade's replacement to the Park and Planning Commission. Mr. Peregrine stated he has lived on Upper Oconomowoc Lake since 1970 and joined the Town of Oconomowoc Plan Commission in 1995. He has practiced law in the City of Milwaukee since 1957, specializing in estate planning and real estate law. The Park and Planning Commission welcomed him and thanked him for committing to serving on the Commission.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Read into record was a Notice of Public Hearing to be held on September 24, 2008 in the County Board Room at 6:30 p.m. regarding the newly prepared Flood Hazard Maps and the amendments to the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance.

Mr. Mace gave a brief overview of the purpose of the hearing and its importance to the County and its residents. He strongly encouraged the Commission to attend. Mrs. Morris asked if the public would be able to attend this meeting and object to any of the maps? Mr. Mace replied no, it was not germane at this hearing. A public hearing was held in 2007 that allowed people to make objections to the maps. Now any changes to the FEMA maps have be made through the Letter of Map Amendment process, which can be is a very lengthy and expensive process.

MEETING APPROVAL:

- *Mrs. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Siepmann and carried unanimously for approval for any member of the Park and Planning Commission to attend the Public Hearing to be held on September 24, 2008 regarding the Flood Hazard Maps.*

MINUTES:

- *Mrs. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Goodchild, and carried unanimously for approval of the August 21, 2008, Minutes as corrected.*

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chairperson Haukohl asked if anyone from the audience wished to address the Commission? With no other public comment, she moved to the next item on the agenda.

SCHEDULED MATTER:

None.

• **CU-1465 (Richard Garbe) Town of Genesee, Section 14**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Report and Recommendation" dated September 4, 2008, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W297 S3206 Boettcher Road L in the NW ¼ of Section 14, Town of Genesee and stated the petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval of earth-altering activities in conjunction with the construction of a pond and ditch.

Mr. Mace identified the ditch that runs through the wetlands on the Garbe property on the aerial photograph. Mrs. Morris questioned whether the ditch was there previously? Mr. Mace replied that he thought it was, using a 1941 aerial to identify it. He continued that Mr. Garbe constructed the pond and used the ditch as an outlet to the downstream wetlands complex. Mrs. Haukohl questioned what was a "ditch plug" and a "perched water table"? Mr. Mace replied it is dirt that is put in the ditch to block the flow of water. He doesn't know how many are required for this project. The DNR has approved the pond, however they want the outlet of the pond into the ditch be plugged. A perched water table is a water table that is elevated above what would be the regional water table and it's perched because there might be a thin lens of heavy silts or clays that prevent it from flowing through the lens into the lower ground water. It exhibits itself oftentimes in the form of seeps in the side of hills and is very common in the glacial terrain of southeastern Wisconsin. She asked if it was a naturally filled pond. Mr. Mace replied, "Yes". Mr. Mitchell commented the Garbe's seem to be very cooperative in regards to this request. As soon as they realized they were in violation, they applied for the necessary permits and paid the after-the fact fees, they were trying to do the right thing. He asked Mr. Garbe to explain where the ditch plugs were being placed and how many were being required?

Mr. Garbe stated they put the creek into the pond in 2002, so the whole thing is new and rather than making it a channel into the pond, they made it a little more decorative and curving. The pond was dug in 2005, is about 4 ft. deep and fills naturally because the water starts at their west lot line and runs to it. The DNR has indicated the pond can remain. There is also some ground water seepage into the pond. He identified the areas the DNR wants him to fill (plug), which will then cause the water to flood the wetland area and cause it to stay wet. He added when they purchased the property, the area was farmed and not wetland. The DNR has indicated that originally it was wetland and they are trying to restore the area to its natural condition. Mrs. Haukohl asked if he understood the conditions and he replied he did. They are working closely with the DNR to correct any problems

Mrs. Haukohl asked if Staff was recommending a fine not be imposed on the Garbe's, because it was a Town Condition? Mr. Mace replied the Town does not have the authority to impose fines as it is a County Code and the enforcement remedies are the responsibility of the County. Corporation Counsel has reviewed the matter and they have agreed with the Staff Recommendation. The Town's condition states the petitioner has to pay the Town a \$1,000.00 forfeiture and the Staff does not feel it is an appropriate way to handle this. Therefore, the Staff is recommending the request be sent back to the Town for reconsideration.

Mrs. Haukohl asked if the Commission could approve everything except Condition No. 12? Mr. Mace stated it would be best to ask the Town to revise that condition and make it either a recommendation or eliminate it and let the County decide whether they are going to pursue a formal violation or not. Mr. Peregrine asked if the County has ultimate jurisdiction, why not just approve the request? Mr. Mace replied there is a provision in the Code that says the County shall include all terms and conditions imposed by the Town, so the Town has indicated this is a requirement and they will need to change it in light of the enforcement provisions of the Code.

Mr. Garbe commented Sharon Leair, of the Town of Genesee, said that “they need to stop these after-the-fact Conditional Use activities” – so they added the \$1,000.00 fine. He believed this is the second Conditional Use that the Town has fined. Mrs. Morris stated she thinks she knows the case where the Town put it on and she would be very interested in knowing if that party paid that fine, and if that person has paid it, do we have the right to tell the Town that they can’t fine Mr. Garbe? Mr. Mace replied he thought that changed, he will check. He stated that Corporation Counsel’s, Debbie and Robyn, feel that since Mr. Garbe has paid the after-the-fact fee, which is double the application fee (\$650.00), and he has been extremely co-operative in coming forward himself, applying for the proper permits and working with the DNR, it is not needed. If we did not have the double fee standard in our Ordinance, then we might be more inclined to commence court action or use the citation procedure. Mrs. Haukohl asked if Mr. Garbe would be able to comply with the November 1st deadline for installing the ditch plugs? He replied he has been working with Alan Barrows and the DNR and should be able to get the site stabilized. It is just a matter of clearing up the matter of the fine.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mrs. Morris and carried unanimously to refer the matter back to the Town of Genesee Plan Commission for reconsideration of Condition No. 12 of their approval letter dated August 7, 2008, regarding the payment of forfeitures and to place the matter on the October 2, 2008 agenda.

• **SCS-593A (Esitec, LLC) Town of Waukesha, Section 9**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Memorandum” dated September 4, 2008, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property on the east side of West St. Paul Ave. (C.T.H. "X"), approximately 600 ft. south of McArthur Ct. in Section 9, Town of Waukesha, and stated the petitioner is requesting approval for the creation of an Outlot not abutting a public road.

Dean Danner, identified several buildings and the features of the site on the aerial photograph. He explained they are selling the west half of the vacant land to a Kwik –Trip for an expansion. Because they are creating an outlot, the Town of Waukesha has required the outlot be restricted so that it cannot be sold except in conjunction with the City of Waukesha lots and that they create a 33 ft. driveway easement to the outlot. The easement document is ready for filing; however, they are just waiting for an approval from this meeting.

John Konopacki, surveyor, explained that proposed Lot 1 has been annexed into the City of Waukesha and proposed Outlot 1’s boundary still remains in the Town of Waukesha. Mrs. Haukohl asked if the Kwik Trip expansion would extend into the floodplain? Mr. Konopacki replied, “No”. Mr. Mace identified the floodplain on the aerial photograph and the buildable area. Mr. Konopacki commented the eastern portion of the parcel will remain in their ownership and contains floodway and floodplain, very little is usable land. Mr. Mace questioned why the one lot is identified as an outlot? Mr. Danner replied the Town of Waukesha designated it as an outlot as different restrictions are imposed on outlots. Esitec didn’t want to have to annex it to the City of Waukesha and pay City taxes on useless land. Currently the three City lots have one building on them and are under one tax key number. If at any time in the future there would be a division

of the three lots, the outlot would have to be tied to at least one of those City lots. It is addressed in Condition No 3. A suggestion was made that the Outlot be combined with the City lots into one Certified Survey Map. Mr. Danner replied it cannot be done because the Outlot is in the Town and the lots are in the City.

After a brief discussion, Mrs. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **(Kevin & Sheila Frisinger) Town of Delafield, Section 22 (Matter heard at the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission Meeting)**

Chairperson Haukohl asked Ms. Barrows, Senior Land Use Specialist, to update the Commission with the Staff's current recommendation based on the "Staff Memorandum" dated September 4, 2008.

Ms. Barrows pointed out on Exhibit "F" (submitted by the petitioner) the area of the original building envelope approved with the subdivision plat and the petitioner's proposed revised building envelope and the new building envelope based on the decision at the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission meeting. She explained, the petitioner's original proposal disturbed the original building envelope approved with the subdivision plat and they have now amended it by moving the envelope outside of the northern corridor and relocating it further to the southeast. The original proposal was not going to disturb the trees, which were located on the north end of the property and now excluded from the building envelope. In addition to disturbing what was originally proposed, a dense stand of trees would be disturbed to a greater extent. At the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission meeting, the Commission approved a building envelope of 15' from all improvements (excluding retaining walls that did not hold back patios or the pool). In the petitioner's original proposal, 53 trees (50 within the building envelope and three (3) outside the building envelope) were proposed to be removed and the current proposal by the petitioner indicates 56 trees would be removed. The Planning and Zoning Division staff originally recommended the removal of 25 trees, and the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission's decision (building envelope to be 15' from all improvements) will allow 63 trees to be removed. On September 2, 2008, the Town of Delafield Plan Commission modified their original decision by approving the petitioner's revised request. In addition, the petitioners would not be required to restore the revised building envelope approved by the Park and Planning Commission in 1991 in a forested condition (as originally recommended by the Town Plan Commission), however, no improvements would be allowed in that area.

Chairperson Haukohl asked what is the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Division Staff? Ms. Barrows responded, the recommendation of the Staff is the same as at the August 21, 2008 meeting, which included the area of the former 1991 residence being restored to a forested condition and excluding a dense stand of trees from the building envelope. It would require the petitioner to redesign and relocate the proposed residence and make modifications to the amount of patio/pool area. Mr. Kolb said at the August 21, 2008, meeting, the consensus of the Commission was that since no Deed Restriction had been filed for the revised 1991 building envelope, Mr. Siepmann's suggestion to reduce the building envelope to 15' around the perimeter of the new residence including improvements was the best approach to the situation. Mr. Mitchell asked, regarding the proposed yard area/open space area, if the petitioner's original plan included replanting half of the trees in that area? Mr. Sherer, from Deep River Partners, replied, "Yes," and stated that a Restoration Plan was submitted dated August 7, 2008, which was approved by the Town. Ms. Barrows said the petitioners are proposing to comply with the Restoration Plan proposed at the August 21, 2008, meeting.

Chairperson Haukohl referred to the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission Minutes which state, that by reducing the building envelope the intent was to save trees. However, by reducing the building envelope the number of trees being removed will be increased from 53 to 63, resulting in a greater disturbance on the south side of the proposed building envelope where the most dense stand of trees is located. She wondered, if the intent was to save trees, why would the Commission recommend the removal of more trees? Mr. Siepmann said that since no Deed Restriction was required for the building envelope modified in 1991, a majority of the Commission felt that legally it would be hard to enforce. By shrinking the envelope and saving as many trees possible it would be a better solution, however, it didn't appear the number of trees being saved was reduced. Chairperson Haukohl said she would rather go back to the petitioner's original proposal from the August 21, 2008, meeting, in which 53 trees were proposed to be removed with the open area being restored, which the Town originally required. Mr. Mitchell said it was his understanding that the Waukesha County Corporation Counsel supports the Planning and Zoning Division Staff's position that a Deed Restriction was not required to be recorded for the 1991 revised building envelope and it would be enforceable. He asked Mr. Peregrine (real estate Attorney) what his opinion was, to which he replied, that it must be recorded.

Mr. Goodchild said when the building envelope was revised in 1991, even though a Deed Restriction was not recorded, the intent was that the building envelope was being changed and the old building envelope ceased to exist. If everyone agreed on the Staff's recommendation, the onus would be on the owner to come up with a new design. He realized it would require extra costs. Mr. Mitchell felt requiring the petitioner to come up with a new design would be extreme, and he would like to work out a solution to save the most trees but also allow the petitioner to go forward with his current plan. Mrs. Morris said after the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission meeting, the Town of Delafield met on September 2, 2008, and approved the Restoration/Landscape Plan. If the Town is happy with their decision she doesn't see any reason for the County to be more restrictive. Chairperson Haukohl disagreed and said she would like to go back to the petitioner's original proposal with fewer trees being disturbed. Mr. Kolb felt it was unreasonable requiring the petitioner to redesign the residence.

Mr. Mace commented that historically, when the houses were built in this particular subdivision, he remembered an adjacent neighbor who proposed a large residence and wanted to grade and remove many trees for a tennis court, swimming pool and associated patios. The Park and Planning Commission (at that time) denied the request because the intent was to set up guidelines and conditions for what could and could not be disturbed in the Primary Environmental Corridor (PEC) for the lots in the subdivision. He also remembered another lot, which, was modified with conditions from the Park and Planning Commission. He said that whether it was recorded or not was not the issue and the intent of the original plat approval by the Park and Planning Commission was to try to protect as much of the PEC as possible. In this case, he thought the location of the residence could be tipped slightly to the north/northeast and the driveway be minimized. He realized the petitioner has requested a driveway large enough for a van to turn around in for a handicapped child, however, the issue is, how much of the PEC can be protected in light of what was originally decided for the entire subdivision. Chairperson Haukohl said she would like to accommodate the petitioner but the Commission needs to make consistent, good land use decisions. She did not feel a decision should be made on whether or not the County would be sued in a lawsuit. Ms. Barrows said out of all of the modified building envelopes proposed, the petitioner's original request had the least disturbance, with the removal of 53 trees (with the exception of the County's). Based on the Park and Planning Commission decision of August 21, 2008, 10 additional or 63 trees would be disturbed and the petitioner's revised request is less than 63 trees.

Mr. Sherer clarified their original proposal required the removal of 53 trees. After further analysis based on the Park and Planning Commission's decision and going through the tree study done by Wachtel Tree Service (tree by tree) there were three additional trees recommended for removal because they were diseased. Ms. Barrows indicated one of the trees was destroyed by construction activities. Mr. Siepmann asked if the three (3) trees were No. 504, 505 and 506? Mr. Sherer replied, "I believe so". Ms. Barrows clarified the three (3) trees were outside of the building envelope. Mr. Siepmann believed the petitioners have the right to remove the trees if they are distressed or diseased. Ms. Barrows said trees are allowed to be removed in the corridor in general if they are dead, dying or diseased trees and/or have a long-term forestry plan with approval from the Planning and Zoning Division. Typically, with that type of approval, the Staff requires the site be restored. Oak wilt was discussed for some trees on the property, but most of the trees on the southeast corridor are healthy oak and walnut trees. It was mentioned in the report that oak wilt may take over most of the oaks on the property sometime in the future, but it does not mean the property should be stripped. She pointed out on the aerial photo, three adjacent properties that contain disturbance close to the road and this property has disturbance close to the road and also where the old house location was and the disturbance is going beyond what the adjacent lots have and the original intent of the subdivision. Mr. Peregrine asked what type of oak trees were on the property, to which Ms. Barrows replied "Red oaks."

Mrs. Morris said, if the petitioner's went to litigation with the County, they were under the understanding that the original building envelope was the lot of record for the subdivision. The previous owners changed the envelope and built towards the back of the lot. The petitioner's may have a good case to take to the Board of Appeals and they would be able to do exactly what they want to do with out coming to the Park and Planning Commission for approval. In addition, the Town of Delafield agreed with the petitioner's request. She indicated she could not vote against what the Town approved. Ms. Barrows clarified that the Park and Planning Commission's decision of August 21, 2008, recommended more disturbance than what the petitioner's originally proposed. She added that the subdivision plat which was originally approved had a condition that said, if the building envelope was proposed to be amended, it would need approval by the Park and Planning Commission. This was done on this property, the legal process was taken and recordation was not required. Therefore, if the petitioner's looked at the plat and the legal envelope and saw the residence was not located in the envelope they could have looked for the note on the plat that the Park and Planning Commission could review and modify the original envelope. Also, the Waukesha County Corporation Counsel is comfortable with the Staff's interpretation.

Mrs. Morris asked if the Commission could limit the amount of trees to be removed to 53 and the petitioners could pick and choose which 53 trees would be removed or if specific trees had to be removed? Ms. Barrows replied, the Staff was basing it on preserving the oak and walnut trees. Mr. Sherer stated the proposal is to remove the trees marked with a black "X" on the plan and protect the remaining trees whether they are inside or outside of the building envelope and in exchange they propose to replace 54 trees, restore some of the undergrowth, prairie seed and reduce the invasive species. Ms. Barrows suggested the Planning and Zoning Division staff review and approve the plan.

Chairperson Haukohl expressed concerns about preserving the trees in the southeast corner. It may mean moving or modifying the location of the residence. She felt Mr. Siepmann had good intentions by trying to reduce the building envelope, however, it ended up that more trees would be removed. In addition, the petitioner could work with the Planning and Zoning Division Staff to protect certain trees, which should not be removed. Mr. Sherer said at the last meeting, a 15' perimeter was approved and this meeting was the final check. He pointed out on Exhibit "F", the area of the original building envelope approved with the subdivision plat, the petitioner's new building envelope based on the decision at the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission meeting and the building envelope of 15' from all improvements

(excluding retaining walls that did not hold back patios or the pool). He stated they moved the building envelope closer to the building to save more trees along the down slope corridor thus the discrepancy between 53 trees and 63 trees. They do not want to take out more trees than they have to. The actual buildable area lines were straightened out so it would be Deed Restrictable without a lengthy document. The building envelope was reduced from 35,000 sq. ft. to 31,000 sq. ft. The open yard space area (location of the 1991 residence) was reduced from 14,000 sq. ft. to 7,000 sq. ft. Ms. Barrows said the Commission should decide the amount and location of the trees to be removed.

Mrs. Morris suggested the 15' offset approved by the Commission on August 21, 2008, be negated and the petitioner's proposal shown on Exhibit "F" be approved. She indicated it would save more trees and the Town approved it. In addition, she felt it is important that a bus/van be able to turn around in the driveway for their handicapped child and that is why the residence was configured in that way. Mr. Mace said the location is not very steep with 1' contours.

Mrs. Morris moved for approval of the petitioner's submitted revised building envelope "Proposed Building Envelope by Petitioner" shown on Exhibit "F", negating the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission approval.

Mr. Goodchild commented that the petitioner has the right to build a residence. He thought a reasonable solution would have been for the residence to be moved slightly to the northeast to save some of the larger trees. He did not have a problem with the petitioner utilizing a portion of the former home site as a yard space/open area. Chairperson Haukohl indicated that she would rather go back to the Staff's original recommendation from the August 21, 2008, meeting, saving more trees and the open area being restored, which the Town originally required.

Chairperson Haukohl indicated there is a motion on the table to approve the building envelope on Exhibit "F". She asked if the conditions in the August 21, 2008, "Staff Memorandum" regarding Tree No.'s 504, 505 or 506 removal and approval of the restoration plan applied? Mr. Mace said Tree No. 462 should also be added. Ms. Barrows suggested that the Planning and Zoning Division Staff review the proposed trees outside of the building envelope and work with the petitioner on the replacement of the trees. Mrs. Morris agreed and said she would like to add that to her motion. Ms. Barrows suggested the Commission go through each of the Conditions listed in the August 21, 2008, "Staff Memorandum" where the wording would need to be changed in several of the Conditions based on the motion, and the date of the completion of the Restoration Plan, as requested by the petitioner, would be changed from July 15, 2009 to July 15, 2010, whereby the Commission did so.

The complete motion is listed below:

Mrs. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried by a vote of 5 to 2 (Mrs. Haukohl and Mr. Goodchild voted against) for approval of the petitioner's submitted revised building envelope "Proposed Building Envelope by Petitioner" shown on Exhibit "F", negating the August 21, 2008, Park and Planning Commission approval, with the Planning and Zoning Division Staff reviewing the proposed removal of the trees outside of the building envelope. In addition, Conditions No. 1, 2 and 3 from the August 21, 2008, "Staff Memorandum" will be revised as follows:

- 1. The original building envelope approved with the subdivision plat shall be revised to show the building envelope area "Proposed Building Envelope by Petitioner" shown on Exhibit "F" and a new deed restriction shall be recorded with the Waukesha County Register of Deeds listing the conditions of this approval including an exhibit, which identifies the***

location of the approved building envelope “Proposed Building Envelope by Petitioner” shown on Exhibit “F”. This condition shall be satisfied prior to the issuance of a Building Permit by the Town of Delafield.

2. *No modifications to the approved building envelope, “Proposed Building Envelope by Petitioner” shown on Exhibit “F”, are permitted without Town and County Plan Commission approval.*
3. *The proposed Restoration/Landscape Plan must be modified in accordance with the comments made in the memorandum above, which are as follows:*
 - *Modifications to the location and design of the residence, pool, patios, and parts of the driveway may be required.*
 - *The Tree Removal Plan must be revised prior to the issuance of a Building Permit by the Town of Delafield to identify the actual number of trees removed on the site based on the approved building envelope. Of special note are tree No.’s 504, 505, 506 and 462, which are not allowed to be removed as those trees are located outside of the approved building envelope, unless approved by the Planning and Zoning Division Staff.*
 - *A combination of trees, shrubs, and an herbaceous layer, with type, size and location identified, must be shown on the Restoration/Landscape Plan along the road and north lot line.*
 - *The revised building envelope (except the driveway portion located within the building envelope approved herein) shown in green on Exhibit “D”, must be restored in compliance with the petitioner’s Restoration/Landscape Plan (Exhibit “E”) and shall include a combination of native trees, shrubs, and an herbaceous layer, with type, size and location identified. The Restoration/Landscape Plan must clearly identify the restoration of this area.*
 - *The Restoration/Landscape Plan must be reviewed and approved by the Town of Delafield and the Waukesha County Planning and Zoning Division staff prior to the issuance of a Building Permit by the Town of Delafield. A letter of credit must be issued to the Planning and Zoning Division in the amount of the actual restoration costs to implement the Restoration/Landscape Plan, in order to allow the Planning and Zoning Division the ability to restore the site at the expense of the owner, in the event the owner does not implement the Restoration Plan, prior to July 15, 2010. The entire site must be restored prior to the expiration date of the Building Permit. A Declaration of Restrictions must be recorded with Register of Deeds, drafted by the Planning and Zoning Division, agreeing to comply with the Restoration/Landscape Plan and maintain the property in compliance with the Restoration/Landscape Plan in perpetuity. Proof of said recordation shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division prior to July 15, 2009.*

The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mrs. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Siepmann to adjourn at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Morris
Secretary

BM:es